



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/608,804

06/30/2003

Nobuko Yamamoto

03500.015716.1

2559

5514

7590

06/30/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

BAUSCH, SARAE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1634

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/30/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/608,804	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YAMAMOTO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SARAE BAUSCH	<b>Art Unit</b> 1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SARAE BAUSCH. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Jason Okun. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 13 June 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 74.

Identification of prior art discussed: Brown.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Possible claim amendments were discussed to overcome the rejection of records. Discussed the claim language does not clearly depict figure A that was submitted with the response mailed 11/07. It was also suggested that even if the claims were amended to clearly reflect figure A the claims would read on northern blotting and there would still be art issues. Suggested to amend the claims to perhaps require a surface composition to overcome prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Sarae Bausch/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required